

with critical weapons unavailable to the pioneers of the preceding century. Miss Haynes in particular is by no means anti-scientific.

While the experiential and experimental findings in *The Seeing Eye/I* are fascinating and in themselves strongly suggestive of the presence of the 'psi-factor' in most human persons and in many animals, Miss Haynes' thesis remains philosophical (or pre-theological)—that the investigation of perception, both normal and paranormal, points to the reality of an abiding self, the I who perceives in every perception, the individual identity which transcends the space-time limitations of mortal existence, sometimes consciously in this life.

Students of phenomenology may find the logic of Miss Haynes' investigation indicative of lines of further research if not themselves compelling evidence. For the results of such an inquiry are necessarily limited by the nature of the cases studied; being exceptional and anecdotal, the reports of paranormal experiences convey indirect support for the existence of the meta-empirical self. But piled in stacks, such reports gain credibility to the extent that their reliability can be ascertained. It is here that Miss Haynes' critical eye proves valuable.

In the midst of a field of legitimate inquiry surrounded by enthusiasts, quacks and madmen, the presence of a prudent critic is not only welcome but essential. Miss Haynes happily devotes nearly a third of her book to a discussion of the

illicit uses of psychical research. Her chapter of the usurpation of language by cultists is particularly acute. She also levels some heavy artillery of logic and common sense against proponents who exalt the irrational and intuitive aspects of the human psyche above mere reason, thus undermining the foundation of scientific, philosophical and theological understanding of an important if uncommon aspect of human life. Her most incisive and pointed critique concerns the unwarranted conclusions proposed by students of reincarnation theory. Here, Miss Haynes scoringly reiterates an earlier criticism of the unsparing use of "Occam's Razor", the simple-minded application of which has surely effected as much harm as good in the history of scientific investigation into areas where multiple causality is at work. A simple explanation is not thereby a true one.

The Seeing Eye/I should be of some interest to theologians and religious writers — at least those not gone wholly over to sentence-diagramming. For the avenues of research into the *experience* of God, immortality and freedom which Miss Haynes identifies promise to be of considerable importance. It is perhaps regrettable that she did not pursue these avenues further herself—her theological asides are often provocative, but not obtrusive. That, however, would (and should) warrant another book.

RICHARD WOODS, O.P.

FELLOW TEACHERS, by Philip Rieff. *Faber and Faber, London, 1975. 243 pp. £3.75*

The genesis of this book lies in "a personal exchange" between the author and two university teachers at Skidmore College, U.S.A. and at a public interview at that college when he answered questions, from staff and students, arising from his two previous books and possible "misunderstanding" (p. 1) about them. Although *Fellow Teachers* is not a direct transcript of "our Skidmore show" (p. 114), it bears many marks of a credo prepared for spoken public statement, filled out into a book by numerous footnotes. These often tend to engulf the whole page, so that the foot dominates the rest of the body, e.g. pages 180 and 181 each

have three lines of text and 37 lines which are part of a footnote starting on p. 179 and extending to p. 182.

One sympathises with his student "who scarcely understood a word I said or wrote"—she probably lost the thread of the argument. The reader of this book has a similar problem in hacking through the undergrowth of footnotes to penetrate to the core.

Another difficulty lies in his use of sociological jargon, e.g. "culture articulates interditory-transgressive polarities". A keyword in his philosophy is "therapeutic" which is used not in its everyday sense but "describes the social procedure of release

from the past" (p. 23). For elucidation of the term, one needs to study his comparatively clear book *The Triumph of the Therapeutic*,

Having discounted the presentation and style, one is left with certain clearly-made points about the state of the universities and education in general, which are relevant to the U.K. as well as the U.S.A. and which are worthy of inclusion in the *Black Papers* edited by Professor C. B. Cox and Dr Rhodes Boyson. Rieff's views on tradition, authority, discipline, punishment, academic excellence and selective education would surely find a welcome there. For instance: "A university is neither a political democracy nor an oligarchy; it is an intellectual aristocracy." (p. 63). Also, "The disciplines of the intellect that constitute higher schooling are inherently undemocratic and need both long preparation and regular exercise in a protected institution uniquely unchanging in its object." (p. 125). Rieff therefore advocates "preventing all changes in the curriculum except those that revert to learning in old disciplines," (p. 196). Where would this leave his own subject of Sociology, which has a "disproportionate number of disturbed young people who seek to study it?" (p. 201)

He notes the "severe loss of nerve" by the "English upper classes", and the attempt to abolish the public school in "an effort to wipe out . . . the institutional encouragement of intellectual aspiration." He laments the "cultural egalitarianism" which is now "the dominant strain in English Socialism." And: "Radical students realise they are not attending a true university and long for its special kind of intellectual authority." But there are "fewer and fewer teachers" who can offer this. His definition of teaching is "strictly to transmit what is already known." (p.122). True; if the main job of the universities is to hand on learning and they fail to do this, the chain of transmission is broken and it may never be possible to reconstruct it. A future generation that decides that it wants, after all, to learn, for instance, ancient languages, may find there is no one able to teach them. Perhaps such teachers may be found in the "enclaves" of "feeling intellect" which Rieff hopes to maintain in the "multiversities" threatened by "research entrepreneurs . . . training

thousands to become functionaries of the huge hospital-state apparatus." (p. 125).

Mr. Rieff sees most of his fellow teachers not as "links to intellectual authority" (p. 15) but consumed by "an ignorant passion for originality" (p. 16). This suggests there should be less emphasis on original research and more on genuine teaching ability as a criterion of tenure of university posts. Rieff laments the "modern commerce in quick turnover of ideas", the trendy penchant for the latest gimmick, "the 'Everything New' Syndrome (p. 195), the determination to be "relevant" and up-to-date. "To be radically contemporaneous is to achieve a conclusive failure of historical memory" (p. 39): something which Marx absolutely desired (p. 78). "To leave the great past unremembered is to be lost in the howling present" (p. 48). This phrase pinpoints one of the depressing elements in the book; the author finds so little in the twentieth century to applaud. The paucity of citations of modern writers is not surprising, as Rieff inclines to read only what he has read before (p. 155). There is no comfort for him elsewhere either: "there are no messages to receive from our visual arts" (p. 137).

Rieff's emphasis on passing on what is already known tends to exclude the place of discovery and creativity in education and there is little sense, in the book, of an understanding of the past helping the development of discriminating judgment of what is good in today's world.

The book has, however, a consoling message for fellow teachers harassed by the effort to keep up with the latest trends and to read the latest books. Mr. Rieff advocates a studied hanging back (p. 87), a reluctance to read present-day authors. So we can opt out of knowing Rieff's first sociological law, his first law of private life (p. 111) and what are Rieff revisionists (p. 115). We may ignore his exhortation to "see, further, everything I have written or may write" (p. 135). Let us, rather, treasure his advice that "we teachers will have to learn how to express ourselves less" (p. 173) and his conclusion that "the best we can do is to practise the art of silence, specially in this period of over-publication." Enough said!

FRANCES BRICE